5-5-1969

The immediate reaction to the Nat Turner rebellion (August - November, 1831)

Rebecca Saunders

THE IMMEDIATE REACTION TO THE NAT TURNER REBELLION (August - November, 1831)

Rebecca Saunders
May 5, 1969

Being primarily concerned with the safety of their wives and children, however, they felt it necessary to secure their protection. This was done in a variety of ways. Some in the grip of terror fled to the woods with only those provisions they could carry by hand, remaining there for days at the time. Others congregated in public places such as Cross Keys, Jerusalem, and the surrounding county seats of Virginia and North Carolina.[2] A letter from Jerusalem on August twenty-forth described the situation there: "Every house, room, and corner in this place is filled with women and children, driven from home, who had to take to the woods, until they could get to this place."[3] This left the farms deserted or in the hands of the blacks.[4] Once the men were assured of the safety of their families, they were ready to join in the search for the rebels.

At first no one was certain of what had occurred, how many slaves were involved, or how many whites had been murdered. This quite naturally gave the people gathering together for protection endless opportunities for speculation. Thus the rumors began to multiply, and the whole affair became as the Richmond Enquirer said,"subject to an extraordinary amount of exaggeration." In Jerusalem there were as many rumors afloat as facts.[5] Many theories were advanced concerning the motives of the insurgents. Some felt their intent was merely to plunder, others that they wished to create panic and then seize power, and still others that they were part of a widespread plot.

While it would have been hard to exaggerate the atrocities of Nat Turner's band, the accounts of the size of his forces and numbers of their outrages were greatly multiplied. For example, The Constitutional Whig of August twenty-ninth referred to reports of the insurrectionist forces swelling to a thousand or twelve hundred and advancing into counties adjacent to Southampton. There were other accounts of Negroes collecting in the Dismal Swamp which were equally beyond the realm of fact. Rumors continued to circulate in Southampton long after the official reports were made public.

Things began to settle down in Southampton as the rebels were brought under control. Sensible citizens would not be swayed by exaggerated stories, and The Constitutional Whig stated in its September twenty-forth issue that even the women had recovered in some measure from their fright. This, however, did not remove the lingering fear in the hearts of many Southampton citizens. It would be a long time before the people could feel comfortable in their homes, for always there was the fear that another insurrection would break out or that this one was a part of a general insurrection to be resumed later.[6] Many, in fact, considered moving out of this area where a "dismal air of foreboding hung over the people."[7]

General W. H. Brodnax, a commanding officer in the militia, summarized very well the state of affairs in the Southampton area in a letter to Governor Floyd of Virginia:

> The consternation unfortunately was not confined to the county where the danger existed, but extended over all immediately about it. Not a white family

> in many neighborhoods remained at home, and many went to other counties, and the rest assembled at different points in considerable numbers for mutual protection. In numerous instances females, with their children, fled in the night with one imperfect dress and no provisions. I found every hovel at Hicks' Ford literally filled with women and children, with no way to lodge but in heaps on the floors, without an article of food or means of procuring or cooking provisions...many seemed willing to encounter starvation itself rather than return home unprotected and while their husbands and sons were in the field.[8]

Not only did terror seize the inhabitants of the immediate area, but it also spread throughout Virginia and North Carolina like a wave. From all over the two states came reports of how people were reacting to the insurrection. The observation in a letter to a slave of Williamson Mann, a semi-literate white man, described the attitude of mind of the population accurately: "every white in this place is scared except myself..."[9]

The alarm was so great that everywhere in Virginia and North Carolina citizens barricaded their homes or huddled together for mutual protection. That the slightest suspicion could touch off panic was evidenced in the accounts coming from a variety of locations. "The people in lower Virginia and the adjacent parts of North Carolina are excessively agitated because of the late massacre in Southampton."[10] Richmond was reported to be in a state of confusion and under tight security. Mr. John C. Stanard of Spotsylvania recalled his attempt to leave Richmond on Monday before the guards were stationed to prevent such travel. Unable to gain admittance to a local tavern, which was already barred against all intruders,

he travelled on, only to be captured by a patrol who mistook him for a Negro.[11] From Petersburg and Winton, N. C. came similar accounts of confusion and excitement.[12] A letter from Halifax, N. C. read: "The Negroes here have risen against the white people, and the whole county is in an uproar. We have to keep guard night and day. We have had no battle yet, but it is expected every hour."[13] Countless reports of the suspected slave uprisings, the fortification of towns, and the suspension of work came from other North Carolina cities.[14] So intense was the fear that the health of some was endangered.[15] Mrs. Lawrence Lewis in her letter to Harrison Gray Otis expressed the general sentiment of the two states.

> The dreadful events of August last in our state, the want of confidence and insecurity produced by those horrors, compel me to address you...our whites unhappily evince too much fear of those wretches... it is like a smothered volcano - we know not when, or where, the flame will burst forth, but we know that death in the most horrid form threatens us. Some have died, others have become deranged from apprehension since the South Hampton affair...I cannot feel secure or happy now.[16]

This atmosphere became a breeding ground for rumors which served to heighten the already existing fears. The city of Richmond was so full of such exaggerations that the editors of the Compiler felt it necessary to write an article on August twenty-ninth to correct them. The stories started out at first as simple exaggerations and imaginings, but eventually they developed into an elaborate network of speculations. Among the rumors afloat was one that deposits of guns, pistols, and knives had been discovered in Nansemond County.[17] In addition, some suspected a connection between the activities of black

preachers in Nansemond, Surry, and Prince George and those of Nat Turner.[18] It was asserted that between two and three thousand Negroes were lodged in the Dismal Swamp.[19] There were numerous reports of slave uprisings, especially in North Carolina. Though they proved to be largely unfounded, these encouraged people to draw their own conclusions about the happenings.

At first it was thought that the motive of the Negroes was to plunder and that their desires were intensified by a taste for blood.[20] Some also feared that the insurgents had fled to the swamp, where they were regrouping in order to launch a fresh attack.[21] It was not long before men began to conclude that all that had happened indicated a general conspiracy among the slaves. In a letter John Wheeler, the postmaster of Murfreesborough, noted that there were strong suspicions in North Carolina that there existed an understanding among the blacks, though there was no evidence to substantiate this.[22] Governor Floyd concurred with this theory of general insurrection, as was reflected in his statement of December 6: "There is much reason to believe that the spirit of insurrection was not confined to Southampton. Many convictions have taken place elsewhere, and some few in distant counties."[23] Belief in a widespread conspiracy was quite prevalent. Even those who would not agree that this was the original intent of Nat Turner's band feared that the recent occurrences might spark such a large scale revolt. A letter from a clear-thinking Richmond businessman to the editor of

the New York Journal of Commerce expressed this sentiment:

> We can now conceive that the murders at Southampton could not have been so much an affair of runaway negroes, as was at first supposed; and the question now arises, if the slaves in that county, would murder the whites, whether they are not ready to do it in any other county in the state, and whether the reports that may spread among the slvaes (sic) in other parts of the states, may not excite those to insurrection that never thought of such a thing before.[24]

Only with the capture of Nat Turner in late October 1831 did the tension begin to ease.

Other areas of the nation did not escape the terror invoked by the Southampton Insurrection. The deep South was the most severely affected by the happenings. Reacting similarly to Virginians and North Carolinians, the citizens of states from South Carolina to Louisiana experienced a sense of panic at the thought of a slave insurrection. In a letter from J. Clay to General Lowell Woolfolk mention was made of a suspected revolt by Negroes and Indians in Columbus, South Carolina.[25] The whole town of Macon, Georgia was aroused in the middle of the night with the report of an armed Negro force within five miles of the town.[26] A letter from Alabama read: "We are in a great state of alarm, in consequence of an attempted rising of the slaves here...My own impression is that the infection is pretty general with the negroes throughout the country."[27] All of the southern states took adequate precautionary measures.

In the North fear of insurrection was not so widespread. There were some accounts of alarm and attempted revolts in Maryland and Delaware.[28] The reaction of the North generally

was one of sympathy and relief at being so far removed from the danger. As the New York American stated: "we would go to the utmost length to sustain the rights and safety of those whom circumstances have placed in the relation of masters"?[29] A number of the abolitionists saw the revolt as a prelude and used the opportunity to give the South a stiff warning, which remained unheeded. Only they accused the slaveholders and reminded them that they had predicted such rebellions would occur, while the rest of the nation sympathized with the victims of the outrage.

The reaction of the public to the Southampton Insurrection particularly manifested itself in two ways. Almost as a reflex action, military preparations were begun on a widespread basis to aid in suppressing the rebellion and to insure protection of the population. Along with this the indignation of the whites at such Negro outrages provoked equally horrid atrocities against the blacks.

Initially there was some difficulty in mustering the militia of Southampton County. This was due to a variety of reasons including the surprise element in the Sunday attack, the fact that many people were attending the camp meeting being held in Gates County, North Carolina, and the uncertainty as to the source and extent of the rebellion.[30] By Monday afternoon a substantial resistance was being offered to the Negro insurgents. Militia units from all the surrounding counties of Virginia and North Carolina were the first to arrive on the scene, about 3000 in number according to the Norfolk Herald.[31]

On Tuesday Governor Floyd became aware of the situation and responded by commissioning four of the best companies of the state militia to go to Southampton and by sending arms.[32] Even the federal government answered the call for aid through the dispatch of warships and men from Fortress Monroe on order of Colonel House.[33] In addition to all of these forces, there were bands of irregulars drifting in from everywhere.[34] By the end of the week there was an overwhelming collection of troops gathered in Jerusalem. They had arrived too late to participate in the suppression of the insurgents, for according to General Epps, commanding officer of the militia, the situation was under control by August the twenty-fifth.[35]

All of the military preparation did not center around aiding Southampton County. People in other areas of Virginia and North Carolina were greatly concerned for their own protection. Cities and towns were fortified and put under heavy guard, for example Richmond and Raleigh.[36] Governor John Floyd in his diary reported numerous requests for arms from all over the state, which he granted. The majority of the citizens seemed to be in a state of readiness, waiting for the slaves to show the slightest sign of revolting, in order to strike them down.

Many not waiting for the Negroes to move, vented their wrath in the most terrible acts of revenge toward them. These atrocities were committed to a large extent by the volunteer troops from other areas who rode through Southampton. They came bent on destroying the Negro insurgents and in their

passion were beyond the control of reason. This attitude was exemplified in the actions of a party from Richmond, who announced their intention to kill every colored person in Southampton. Upon crossing the line, they saw a free Negro man standing in his yard. When they questioned him, he informed them that they were in Southampton; and without hesitation they shot him dead. Many similar acts of torturing, maiming, and burning alive of both guilty and innocent slaves by these search parties were reported in petitions to the legislature for the loss of slave property.[37] The Rev. G. W. Powell observed that "many negroes are killed every day: the exact number will never be ascertained."[38] Their mangled bodies or severed heads were hung by the roadside to serve as a warning to slaves who might be comtemplating further rebellion. The words of Charity Bowery, a well known New York Negro, as recorded by Lydia Maria Child testified to the fact that Negroes needed no further warning:

> At the time of the old prophet Nat the colored folks was afraid to pray loud, for the whites threatened to punish 'em dreadfully, if the least noise was heard. The patrols was low drunken whites, and in Nat's time, if they heard any of the colored folks praying or singing a hymn, they would fall upon 'em and abuse 'em, and sometimes kill 'em, afore master or missis could get to 'em.[39]

Those in responsible positions expressed concern over the senseless slaughter of the Negroes. The newspapers were among the first to voice their protest. The editor of the Richmond Whig stated his opposition to the killing of many blacks without a trial and the other acts of barbarity.[40]

An article in the National Intelligencer quoted a correspondent as saying:

> It is with pain that we speak of another feature of the Southampton Rebellion, for we have been most unwilling to have our sympathies for the sufferers diminished or affected by their misconduct. We allude to the slaughter of many blacks without trial and under circumstances of great barbarity...We met with an individual of intelligence who told us that he himself had killed between ten and fifteen... We (the Richmond troop) witnessed with surprise the sanguinary temper of the population who evinced a strong disposition to inflict immediate death on every prisoner.[41]

The military officials of Southampton voiced their dismay at the outrages. In a public statement General Epps confessed his deepest sorrow for any of the barbaric atrocities which had occurred and made it clear to the white citizens that any further acts of violence would be unexcused and punished if necessary by rigors of war.[42] General Brodnax testified to the difficulty the judicious and cool-headed among them had in restraining the indiscriminate from the slaughter of all suspected blacks.[43]

The cruelties were not confined to Southampton nor to the black race alone. Numerous accounts record arrests, whippings, and lynchings in North Carolina and the Virginia counties of Sussex and Prince George.[44] An English book salesman named Robinson was whipped, stripped, and sent on foot from Petersburg to Richmond, because he dared to voice his opinion that the blacks as men were entitled to their freedom.[45]

This unreasoned revenge taken by the whites indicated both their contempt for the slaves as persons and their fear

of them in mass. Regarding them only as valuable property, they shamelessly destroyed them when they threatened the security of the white community. Driven by blind fear and hatred, a segment of the white population reduced itself to the barbaric level of those insurgents whose acts it had considered so appalling.

The newspapers provide interesting insights concerning the aftermath of the slave revolt, because they simultaneously reflected and attempted to mold public opinion. Published in Richmond, The Constitutional Whig and the Richmond Enquirer gave the best coverage of events and exerted a great influence in Virginia and the entire South. Other newspapers drew heavily on their accounts, and the way in which they dealt with so controversial a subject seems to be fairly representative of the attitudes of the Southern press in general. In the initial recounting of the happening in Southampton, the editors of the Whig and the Enquirer expressed concern for the exaggerations surrounding it and their sincere desire to clarify such misconceptions.[46] This concern continued throughout the entire coverage up to Nat's execution.

At first there were few accurate reports on which to build a story. As early as August 23, 1831, the Whig reported an uprising citing letters from the postmaster of Southampton and the actions of the Governor as proof. Not until the twenty-fifth were they able to report any more facts. At this time a letter from Petersburg was published assuring the public that the band of Negro insurgents were being countered by white

troops and would soon be apprehended.[47] Not until the twenty-sixth did an official dispatch come from General Epps, commanding officer of the troops in Southampton, ordering the Richmond Dragoons to return home and giving some information about the number of whites murdered. In this same issue a letter from Petersburg appeared bearing the first detailed account of the events. Letters speculating on the insurrection and exaggerated reports began in the August twenty-sixth edition and increased in the August twenty-ninth one. The senior editor of the Whig, who was on hand at the scene, observed the panic of the white citizens and therefore attempted to provide an accurate account of what was occurring.[48]

The Richmond Enquirer compiled an extensive report on the insurrection which did not appear until August thirtieth. The information therein was similar to the Whig's, but the sources were different. Accounts of what was happening in Southampton came chiefly from letters of the citizens and official military reports. By including newspaper articles from other Virginia and North Carolina cities, the Enquirer was able to give a picture of what the reactions were to the rebellion.[49]

Both newspapers continued their coverage into September and October, but as time passed the accounts became more dominated by the speculations, rumors, and false alarms of further uprisings. Although the editors of the Whig, Enquirer, and Compiler were disturbed by misconceptions, they were not above printing these letters and stories. For instance, after expressing alarm at these exaggerations, the Enquirer commented:

"What strikes us as the most remarkable thing in this matter is the horrible ferosity of these monsters. They remind us of a parcel of blood thirsty wolves rushing down from the Alps; or rather like a former incursion of the Indians upon white settlements..."[50] This type of sensationalism itself provoked men to wrath. Although the papers spoke out strongly against the barbaric acts of revenge, they did in fact encourage them with such journalism.

The question of Southern censorship is often raised. No doubt exists that the editors tried to use their papers to calm the public. According to the Raleigh Register, it printed a story concerning the insurrection to "allay the anxiety of the public until something official appears."[51] On the twenty-fifth of August the following appeared in the Whig: "There is therefore no cause for the slightest alarm. But it was necessary to send a sufficient force to the spot to scour the county, and secure all the misguided wretches who have taken part in this insurrection."[52] Likewise on the eighth of September, the Whig expressed concern over a letter published in the New York Journal of Commerce speculating on further uprisings, commenting that at no time was the city as safe as after a revolt when everyone was on guard.[53] The Enquirer ran an article on August thirthieth from the Richmond Commercial Compiler reassuring the public that "everything was perfectly quiet in our city - our colored population was never more tranquil..."[54]

It is difficult to ascertain whether certain facts were deleted from newspaper accounts as the Niles' Weekly Register

suggested. It made the accusation that there "have been many executions in Virginia and North Carolina and some, we believe, in other states - about which little has been said in the public papers."[55] Few detailed accounts of the acts of suppression and revenge against the Negro were given, although mention was frequently made of them. It is not known whether this was a deliberate attempt at censorship or whether it was the logical outgrowth of the belief that the worth of a black man's life was considerably less than that of a white man's. Whatever the attempts at censorship or molding the public opinion were, they were generally too inconsistent and poorly executed to exert much influence.

Newspapers in other parts of the nation had a different tone in their articles relating to the Nat Turner affair. Unlike the Richmond papers, they deemphasized the events themselves, dealing mainly with the repercussions they had and would have. Accounts generally covered four areas. In recording the events of the insurrection, they took note of the unfounded rumors being spread abroad. Much attention was given to the cruelties committed against the slaves and free Negroes in revenge. The Northern papers acknowledged concern over the insecurity and fear so present among Southerners, which they expected would lead them to "counsel from their fears rather than their reason."[56] In lieu of harsher suppression, they encouraged the South to adopt various plans of gradual emancipation, colonization, and the like.

The attitude of most northern newspapers was sympathetic.

Many made similar statements to this one appearing in the New York Journal of Commerce. "For, much as we abhor slavery; much as it is abhored throughout the northern and eastern states; there is not a man of us who would not run to the relief of our friends in the South, when surrounded by the horrors of a servile insurrection."[57] The Liberator, edited by William Lloyd Garrison, raised protest to this sentiment, which was representitive of the northern abolitionist reaction to the insurrection.

Garrison pointed out that he and other abolitionists had predicted this would happen if the southern states perpetuated the immoral system of slavery.[58] Not only did he lack sympathy for the victimized Southampton citizens, he was impatient with northerners who would condone the masters in such a repressive society simply because they were white.[59] The Liberator further warned that unless gradual emancipation or like measures were put into effect to bring about the abolition of slavery, such uprisings as Turner's rebellion would increase. This belligerent attitude was characteristic of only a minority of northerners, but a minority which was to have an increasing influence on the question of slavery.

From the first sound of alarm some men saw that the insurrection demanded serious consideration of what could be done to prevent one from recurring. Eventually the state of Virginia as a whole and the rest of the nation came to share this concern. Within the months following Nat Turner's revolt, two trends in thinking were developing. Many adopted the view that

through some plan of emancipation and colonization their Negro problem could be solved. Others, however, considered suppression of the blacks a more feasible and immediate plan of relief.

The question of the disestablishment of slavery and colonization of the Negroes in Africa became an open one. Petitions, memorials, and resolutions flooded the Virginia governor's office. These can be categorized into three classes calling for the removal of the free Negro, the amendment of the federal constitution providing for the purchase of the slaves by Congress and their transportation to Africa, and gradual emancipation of the slaves.[60]

At first there was an impulsive movement for the increased colonization of Negroes. Letters like one from Preston County to the editor of the Whig explained that no solution was possible for the type of rupture caused by the insurrection except the removal of the Negroes to Africa.[61] Governor Floyd particularly emphasized the importance of colonizing the free Negro.[62] According to the Norfolk Beacon, Southampton free Negroes received frequent visits from patrols encouraging them to go to Liberia.[63]

Mere colonization of free Negroes and a few slaves was not sufficient to solve the crisis. Realizing that slavery was both a danger to the nation and inconsistent with the principles on which it was founded, many Virginians came out in favor of abolition of the institution. Among those strongly advocating this were the citizens west of the Blue Ridge moun-

tains and religious groups like the Quakers of Charles City County.[64] Letters came from Philadelphia, Boston, Albany, and Orange County, Virginia urging Governor Floyd to support emancipation of the slaves.[65] Floyd himself stated his feelings in his diary. "Before I leave this government, I will have contrived to have a law passed gradually abolishing slavery in this state, or at all events to begin the work by prohibiting slavery on the West side of the Blue Ridge Mountains."[66] The anti-slavery sentiment in the state was extremely strong. "Many were opposed to the institution of slavery but few were willing to pay the cost of exterminating it."[67] With the eventual death of the movement for emancipation and widespread colonization, the agitation for suppression, which had been growing up beside it, filled the vacuum.

The activities of the vigilante committees soon led to the passing of new repressive laws all over Virginia. The appearance of stricter black codes was especially prevalent in the eastern part of the state. Viewing these as necessary precautionary methods, even men like the governor gave their approval.[68]

It was generally believed that Negro preaching was chiefly responsible for the fomenting of insurrection. As E. P. Guion noted "these verry Slaves would have Remained quiet but for this fanatic Black that has excited them to this diabolical deed. Some of them were wounded and in the aggonies of the Death declared that they was going happy fore that God had a hand in what they had been doing..."[69] Therefore, the Virginia

laws were amended to limit the church life of Negroes. No longer could blacks preach or hold meetings for religious purposes either. Slaves were likewise prohibited from attending any such services and could only attend white services with permission of their masters.[70] Several white churches reported trouble with their Negroes and expressed a desire for advice from a larger body on how to handle them.[71] The Religious Herald advised that the best course was to examine them closely and to withhold licenses for separate preaching, but not to exclude them from the activities of the church as some Southside churches had done.[72]

In addition to the religious restrictions, other measures were taken. Slaves were not allowed to carry fire arms. Neither were they permitted to sell or give away liquor.[73] No slave was to be taught to read and write.[74] These laws were more than idle words for they were rigidly enforced by a fearful white population. In the words of Governor John Floyd: "Vigilance is the watchword. The law against unlawful assembly of the colored people should be especially put into execution."[75] The result was the general tightening up of the apparatus of suppression in Virginia and also the rest of the South.

Conclusion

Within the initial reactions to the uprising in Southampton were foreshadowed the central issues around which the crisis of the nation for the next three decades would revolve. The deep-seated fear which manifested itself after the insurrection was not something new in the South, but from this time on it became increasingly dominant and intensified. Not only was there fear of the slaves but also of any attempt to suggest a modification of the established way of life. The censorship of the newspapers evidenced an attempt to suppress free thought which might provoke change. Although the revolt had raised the possibility of the abolition of slavery, it eventually led to a close-minded acceptance and defense of the institution. With the frustration of the attempts at emancipation and colonization, the forces of repression gained strength. The Nat Turner Insurrection had considerable effect on the attitude toward slavery in both the North and the South and marked the point at which the two sentiments began to rapidly diverge, finally culminating in the Civil War.

FOOTNOTES

[1]T. W. Higginson, "Nat Turner's Insurrection," in Atlantic Monthly (Boston, 1861), VIII, p. 179.

[2]William Sidney Drewry, The Southampton Insurrection (Washington, D. C., 1900), p. 79.

[3]Richmond Enquirer, 30 August 1831.

[4]The Constitutional Whig, 29 August 1831.

[5]Enquirer, 30 August 1831.

[6]Whig, 29 August 1831.

[7]Whig, 17 September 1831.

[8]Cited in Drewry, Insurrection, p. 78.

[9]Cited in Herbert Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts (New York, 1943), p. 304.

[10] Niles' Weekly Register, 17 September 1831, p. 35.

[11] Drewry, Insurrection, pp. 77-78.

[12] Whig, 26 August 1831 and Enquirer, 24 August 1831.

[13] Cited in Enquirer, 30 August 1831.

[14] Enquirer, 30 August 1831 and Whig, 16 September 1831.

[15] Herbert Aptheker, Nat Turner's Slave Rebellion (New York, 1966), pp. 64-65.

[16] Cited in Aptheker, Turner's Rebellion, p. 60.

[17] Richmond Compiler, 3 September 1831, cited in Aptheker, American Revolt, p. 307.

[18] Richmond Compiler, 1 September 1831, cited in the National Intelligencer, No. 4663.

[19] New York Gazette, cited in The Liberator, 17 September 1831.

[20] Norfolk Herald, in Niles', 3 September 1831.

[21] Report from Belfield cited in Whig, 26 August 1831.

[22] Cited in National Intelligencer, 31 August 1831.

[23] Cited in Higginson, "Insurrection," p. 181.

[24]Cited in Aptheker, Turner's Rebellion, pp. 58-59.

[25]Ibid, pp. 69-70.

[26]Higginson, "Insurrection," p. 182.

[27]Cited in Aptheker, Turner's Rebellion, pp. 69-70.

[28]Higginson, "Insurrection," p. 182.

[29]Cited in Joseph Clark Robert, The Road From Monticello (Durham, 1941), p. 7.

[30]Drewry, Insurrection, pp. 75-77.

[31]Whig, 26 August 1831 and Enquirer, 30 August 1831.

[32]John Floyd, "The Diary of John Floyd" in The John P. Branch Historical Papers of Randolph Macon College, V, p. 151.

[33]Drewry, Insurrection, p. 82.

[34]Robert, Road, p. 3.

[35]Floyd, "Diary," p. 152.

[36]Drewry, Insurrection, pp. 77-78 and Aptheker, American Revolts, p. 310.

[37]Legislative Petitions, December 1831, Southampton County. 9803, 9804, 9804-A, Virginia State Library.

[38]Cited in Higginson, "Insurrection", p. 179.

[39]Ibid, p.180.

[40]Aptheker, American Revolts, p. 301.

[41]Cited in Higginson, "Insurrection", p. 301.

[42]Aptheker, Turner's Rebellion, p. 61.

[43]Higginson, "Insurrection," p. 180.

[44]Aptheker, Turners Rebellion, p. 67 and American Revolts, p. 307.

[45]Higginson, "Insurrection," p. 180.

[46]Whig, 23 August 1831 and Enquirer 30 August 1831.

[47]Whig, 23-25 August 1831.

[48]Whig, 26-29 August 1831.

[49]Enquirer, 30 August 1831.

[50] Enquirer, 30 August 1831.

[51] Robert N. Elliott, "The Nat Turner Insurrection As Reported in the North Carolina Press", in The North Carolina Historical Review, XXXVIII, p. 6. (January - October, 1961)

[52] Whig, 25 August 1831.

[53] Whig, 8 September 1831.

[54] Cited in Enquirer, 30 August 1831.

[55] Niles', 19 November 1831, p. 221.

[56] Boston Courier cited in Niles' 10 September 1831, p. 19.

[57] Cited in The Liberator, 10 September 1831, p. 147.

[58] Ibid, 3 September, p. 142.

[59] Ibid, 10 September, p. 147.

[60] Charles Ambler, Sectionalism In Virginia from 1776 To 1861 (Chicago, 1910), p. 188.

[61] Whig, 29 September 1831.

[62] Ambler, Sectionalism, p. 188.

[63] The Liberator, 15 October 1831.

[64] Ambler, Sectionalism, p. 188.

[65] John Floyd, Slave and Free Negro Letterbook

[66] Floyd, "Diary." 21 November 1831.

[67] John W. Cromwell, "The Aftermath of Nat Turner's Insurrection." in the Journal of Negro History, V, p. 225. (April, 1920)

[68] Ambler, Sectionalism, p. 188.

[69] Cited in Thomas Ruffin, The Papers of Thomas Ruffin, ed by J. G. Ham. Hamilton (Raleigh, 1918-20). p. 45.

[70] June P. Guild, Black Laws of Virginia (Richmond, 1936), p. 107.

[71] Black Creek Church Minutes Book and the Religious Herald, 14 October 1831.

[72] Religious Herald, 14 October 1831 and Robert, Road, p. 107.

[73]Guild, Black Laws, p. 107.

[74]Beverley B. Munford, Virginia Attitudes Toward Slavery and Succession (New York, 1911), p. 43.

[75]Cited in Enquirer, 2 September 1831.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

a. Newspapers

The Constitutional Whig (Richmond, Virginia), 25 August-4 November 1831.

The complete collection of the Whigs appearing in this period proved to be essential to this paper. The accounts were generally composed of letters and original information reported with an effort at accuracy. They provided much of the needed insights into the reaction to the rebellion.

Fredericksburg Political Arena, 2 September-16 September 1831.

Due to limited access to copies of this paper, it was only useful in furnishing a few accounts from other newspapers.

The Liberator (Boston, Massachusetts), 3 September-15 October 1831.

Copies of this abolitionist paper were extremely helpful in gaining an understanding of this extremist view. Not only did the paper contain a great deal of editorial opinion but included articles from other northern newspapers. These were useful in establishing a picture of the northern sentiment.

Niles' Weekly Register (Baltimore, Maryland), 3 September-19 November 1831.

This paper provided an excellent middle-of-the-road commentary. While far from approaching Garrison's opinions, it added some interesting insights beyond the accounts of Virginia papers.

National Intelligencer (Washington, D. C.), 31 August-17 September 1831.

In writing the paper, this source was not very helpful, because almost all of its articles were drawn from other available newspapers.

Religious Herald (Richmond, Virginia), 26 August-14 October 1831.

The church paper presented another angle from which to examine the topic, but it was only moderately useful.

Richmond Enquirer, 30 August-8 November 1831.

This is an essential source for the paper. Its coverage contains not only factual material but a great deal of opinions in letters and other newspaper articles. These reflect the opinions of a variety of sections of the state.

Richmond Whig and Commercial Journal, 24 August 1831.
Since this consisted of articles on the insurrection chiefly from the Whig, it did not add any information.

b. Other

Black Creek Church Minutes Book, December 1831. Located in the Virginia Baptist Historical Society, Richmond, Va.
Brief statement on the church's problems with its black members supported other such accounts.

Floyd, John, "The Diary of John Floyd", edited by Charles H. Ambler. The John P. Branch Historical Papers of Randolph Macon College, V. Richmond, 1918.
The observation of Governor Floyd in his diary were most helpful in ascertaining his own feelings about the rebellion and also the reaction of the state.

Floyd, John, Slave and Free Negro Letterbook.
The Virginia State Library Archieves, Richmond, Va.
This collection of various tracts, letters, and newspapers which came to Governor Floyd was an invaluable source. From it a wide variety of opinions and reactions were learned.

Legislative Petitions, December 1831, Southampton County.
The Virginia State Library, Archieves, Richmond, Va.
These were useful in substantiating the atrocities committed by whites to Negroes.

Minutes of the Virginia Portsmouth Baptist Association, 25-28 May 1832. The Virginia Baptist Historical Society.
The letter from Mill-Swamp Church requesting advice on the course of action it should take toward its black members was useful.

Ruffin, Thomas. The Papers of Thomas Ruffin, . Collected and edited by J. G. DeRoulhac Hamilton. Raleigh: Edwards & Broughton, 1918-20.
In these papers there was a letter describing some of the suppressive measures. Other than this they were of little help.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

Ambler, Charles Henry. Sectionalism In Virginia from 1776 To 1861. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1910.
The book points out some very interesting trends in attitudes resulting from the Turner slave revolt.

Aptheker, Herbert. American Negro Slave Revolts. New York: International Publishers, 1943.
A very strong work dealing with slave revolts in general but giving considerable information on Turner's Rebellion.

Aptheker, Herbert. Nat Turner's Slave Rebellion. New York: Humanities Press, Inc., 1966.
This is the strongest secondary work available. It presents a great deal of well-documented material and is extremely helpful in evaluating the reactions.

Cromwell, John W. "The Aftermath of Nat Turner's Insurrection," Journal of Negro History, V (April, 1920), 208-34.
This excellent article dealing with immediate and long term effects of the revolt was a good background for forming ideas for the paper.

Drewry, William Sidney. The Southampton Insurrection. Washington, D. C.: The Neale Co., 1900.
A standard work on the incident, the book provides much factual material, although the overall approach is somewhat bias in favor of the Southern view.

Eaton, Clement. Freedom of Thought In the Old South. New York: Peter Smith, 1951.
From this book came the idea that there was possibly some problem of censorship in the news accounts.

Elliott, Robert N. "The Nat Turner Insurrection as Reported in the North Carolina Press", The North Carolina Historical Review, XXXVIII (January-October, 1961), 1-18.
This added a specific case of how North Carolina newspapers covered the event.

Guild, June P. Black Laws of Virginia. Richmond: Whittet & Shepperson, 1936.
The book was good for the brief list of laws enacted to suppress the slaves after the revolt.

Higginson, T. W., "Nat Turner's Insurrection," Atlantic Monthly, VIII (August, 1861), 173-187.
The article was most useful in providing facts, first hand accounts, and reactions to Nat Turner's Insurrection.

Johnson, F. Roy. The Nat Turner Slave Insurrection. Murfreesboro, N. C.: Johnson Publishing Co., 1966. Background.

Although the information in this book was not used in the paper, it was a good background source.

Munford, Beverley B. Virginia Attitudes Toward Slavery and Succession. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1911.
Only slightly helpful.

Robert, Joseph Clark. The Road From Monticello, A Study of the Virginia Slavery Debates of 1832. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1941.
The introductory sections had useful comments from the period.

Whitfield, Theodore M. Slavery Agitation in Virginia 1829-1832. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1930.
Only a brief section on the subject, therefore of little value.